



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,581	07/15/2003	Ekambaram Balaji	030773/2868P	8889
7590 Sandeep Jaggi LSI Logic Corporation Intellectual Property Law Department 1551 McCarthy Blvd., M/S D-106 Milpitas, CA 95035			EXAMINER PRICE, NATHAN E	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/14/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are pending.
2. This Office Action is in response to communications received 09 January 2008. Previous objections and rejections not included in this Office Action have been withdrawn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09 January 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach providing an adapter API used to translate data as claimed in step (a) of claim 31. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs that perform mapping for XML can be in the client (§127).
5. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach data sources are stored in different formats and are not directly accessible by other client applications as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the client applications can be based on Java or non-Java systems and can operate on any platform, which teaches or at least suggests the clients use different formats such that the data sources are not directly accessible by other client applications (§37).

6. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach modifying client applications to invoke methods of the API. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs are pluggable, which teaches modifying the client applications to invoke methods of the API (§§115, 127).

7. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach the API at the client using a registered schema definition to convert the data as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sharma teaches the APIs that perform mapping for XML can be in the client (§127) and use of registered schema definition to convert the data (§72, 130).

8. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach submitting the XML files to an import repository at a server and storing data in a database as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Initially, use of the same terms (“import repository” and “database”) is not necessary for a reference to teach the same functionality. Sharma teaches or suggests submitting XML files to an import repository by teaching the server can act as a file server (§5). Sharma further teaches or suggests the XML files are parsed and stored in a database by teaching an XML parser and that the server can act as a file server, which would include the database (§5, 173). Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach the import repository and database as being separate, but the claim does not appear to specify that the repository does not contain the database.

9. Regarding the other claims and cited references, Applicant appears to rely on the arguments that have been addressed above to argue that limitations are not taught by the combination of references.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2,3,6,7,9,14,15,18,19,21,26-28 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645 A1; hereinafter Sharma) in view of Chiang et al. (US 6,948,174 B2; hereinafter Chiang) and Fry (US 6,880,125 B2).

11. As to claim 31, Sharma teaches a method for providing data integration and exchange between a plurality of client applications over a network, wherein each of the client applications access a respective data source (§§ 5, 65, 115), the method comprising:

(a) providing an adapter API at each of the client applications that provides a first set of methods for the client applications to use to translate data in the respective data sources into XML format, wherein the data sources of each of the client applications are

stored in different formats and are not directly accessible by the other client applications (Fig. 5; ¶ 5, 8 – 10, 37, 115, 127);

(b) modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format according to a registered schema definition (¶ 7, 72, 91, 115, 127, 130);

(c) submitting each of the XML files to an import repository at a server (¶ 5, 115, 127); and

(e) parsing the validated XML files in the import repository and storing name/value pairs in a database at the server according to a hierarchy specified by the corresponding DTD, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources of the client applications (¶ 7, 55 – 56, 127, 173).

12. Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML format data from the respective data sources in XML files. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format data in an XML file (col. 8 lines 2 - 16; col. 11 lines 18 -46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because both disclose converting data to XML in order to provide compatibility between different systems.

13. Sharma fails to specifically teach validation as claimed. However, Fry teaches validating each of the XML files in the import repository against a document

Art Unit: 2194

type definition (DTD) corresponding to the respective data sources (col. 2 lines 61 - 65; col. 3 lines 60 - 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because Sharma teaches that a streaming parser can be used (§ 123) and Fry provides further information on parsers, including streaming parsers (col. 3 lines 60 - 64).

14. As to claim 2, Sharma teaches including a second set of methods in the adapter API for the client applications that provides consumption logic and methods for automatically exporting data defined in a Web-based schema registry, from the database into the client applications using Web services (§ 5, 28, 115, 127);

15. As to claim 3, Sharma teaches registering the respective data sources with a schema registry in order to create the schema definition and the DTD (§ 7, 72, 91, 130).

16. As to claim 6, Sharma teaches the adapter API includes an XML API comprising the first set of methods and the second set of methods, wherein the first set of methods comprises a Writer API and the second set comprises a Reader API (§ 5, 115, 155, 173).

17. As to claim 7, Sharma teaches that the client applications are modified with generator logic that makes calls to methods comprising the adapter API, wherein once called, the Writer API converts data into the XML format in memory and transports the

Art Unit: 2194

data to the server (§ 115, 155, 173). Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML format data in an XML file. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format data in an XML file (col. 8 lines 2 - 16; col. 11 lines 18 -46).

18. As to claim 9, Sharma fails to specifically teach verification as claimed. However, Fry teaches wherein the adapter further includes verification code that verifies the generated XML data against the DTD defined in the schema registry (col. 2 lines 61 - 65; col. 3 lines 60 - 64).

19. As to claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 32 and 33, see the rejection of claims 31, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9.

20. As to claim 28, Sharma teaches that the server further includes a schema generator for generating the schema definition, a DTD generator for generating the DTD, and an adapter software kit that is downloaded from the server and used to incorporate the adapter API into the client applications (§ 7, 27, 72, 109).

### ***Conclusion***

21. The prior art made of record on the P.T.O. 892 that has not been relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Careful consideration of the cited art is required prior to responding to this Office Action, see 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).



22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **NATHAN PRICE** whose telephone number is (571)272-4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 2:30pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP

/Li B. Zhen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194